



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/777,614

02/05/2001

Christopher P. Bergh

10235-048001

6722

26161 7590 08/21/2008

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

ALVAREZ, RAQUEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3688

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/21/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/777,614	Applicant(s) BERGH ET AL.	
	Examiner Raquel Alvarez	Art Unit 3688	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/7/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to communication filed on 5/17/2008.
2. Claims 1-43 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

3. The numbering of claims 40-43 is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 17-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLapa et al. (6,076,068 hereinafter Delapa) in view of Langseth et al. (6,694,316 hereinafter Langseth).

With respect to claims 17, 19-20, 25-27, 30, 31, 33, 35-36, 40 and 43 DeLapa teaches a computer-controlled method for managing and distributing offers (abstract). Producing a marketing campaign comprising a plurality of offers specified by offer data

processing rules from which one or more of the offers are identified for targeting specific individuals (i.e. marketing campaign containing a plurality of coupons parameters for targeting specific shoppers)(col. 8, lines 35 to col. 9, lines 1-17); prioritizing offers for an individual to determine which offer should be sent to the individual from multiple offers associated with the individual (i.e. determining from targeted, default or mandatory offers); selecting a prioritized offer from the prioritized offers for presenting to the individual associated with those prioritized offers)(see Figure 20).

With respect to presenting the offers to the individuals over one of a plurality of delivery channels associated with the offer. Langseth teaches Langseth teaches selecting the advertisements or offers based on the capability of the channels to the selected offers. Langseth teaches selecting from a plurality of channels which advertisements to place based on the channel capacity and content of the channel. Langseth, clearly teaches in step 928, the advertisements being selected based on the channel being run or the capacity of the channel. Each channel accommodates or is capable of outputting different types of ads. For example, a golf site may only enable access to a sports channel. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have included in the system of DeLapa the teachings of Langseth of presenting the offers to the individuals over one of a plurality of delivery channels associated with the offer because such a modification would **"provide a readable available medium for delivery of the right information at the right time"** (Langseth col. 3, lines 6-10).

With respect to the newly amended feature of prioritizing offers for an individual based upon privacy characteristic defined by the individual, from multiple offers. In DeLapa by the shoppers behaviors such as his purchases and selection of the purchases are taking into account in order to prioritize the offers to the customers. For example based on the shopper characteristics such as redemption of multiple offers will determine the type of offers he or she will receive. For example, **the heaviest shoppers may be awarded more coupons than less frequent shoppers** (col. 5, lines 15-30) the heavier shopper will receive more **targeted** offers based on his individual shopping and redemption of the offers.

Claims 18, 23-24, 34 further recite determining a channel to select based on user response to an offer. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in marketing to determine how well users response to ads on TV versus ads in the radio in order to select how the ads are going to be delivered based on the user's responses. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have included determining a channel to select based on user response to an offer in order to allow the advertisers to determine the best delivery medium.

Claims 21-22, 37-38 further recite the capacity of the channels being related to the monetary cost of the channel. Official notice is taken that it is old and well known for monetary and operating cost being related to the capacity of the channels. For example, CNN will have a higher capacity than a local smaller channel with a smaller budget. It would have been obvious to have included the capacity of the channels being

related to the monetary cost of the channel because such a modification would allow the channels to invest and better maintain the channels in order to have a higher chances of being selected.

With response to claims 28-29, 32 and 41-42, DeLapa further teaches reporting the effectiveness of the plurality of offers and presenting a sequence of related offers to those individuals based on the individuals activities (i.e. tracking coupon redemption in order to further target coupons to the individual).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant argues that the teachings of DeLapa and Langseth, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest prioritizing offers for an individual, based upon at least one privacy characteristic defined by the individual, from multiple offers. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because in DeLapa by the shoppers behaviors such as his purchases and selection of the purchases are taking into account in order to prioritize the offers to the customers. For example based on the shopper characteristics such as redemption of multiple offers will determine the type of offers he or she will receive. For example, **the heaviest shoppers may be awarded more coupons than less frequent shoppers** (col. 5, lines 15-30) the heavier shopper will receive more **targeted** offers based on his individual shopping and redemption of the offers.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Point of contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raquel Alvarez whose telephone number is (571)272-6715. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric w. Stamber can be reached on (571)272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3688

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Raquel Alvarez/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3688

Raquel Alvarez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3688

R.A.
8/7/2008